A scheme is proposed to hide data in images based on a prioritized ordering of the content of the host (or cover) image. A watermark embedding process uses the watermark strength to determine the ordering of the 16 regions resulting from the second level Discrete Wavelet Transform (DWT) decomposed content of the host image. To determine the best ordering for hiding the data, various types of images of varying content and, hence, visual complexity were considered, analyzed and ranked in terms of their ability to withstand changes that do not imperil the visual quality (PSNR) of their watermarked versions depending on which an N×N-sized watermark stream is hidden in the 8 highest ranked sub-bands of the host image. From this perspective, an ordering for images classified as simple, normal and complex images was used to determine a generalized ordering of the DWT decomposed sub-bands of the image. The generalized ordering presented here ascertains that the content of the image and its visual complexity had little effect on an earlier proposed prioritized ordering of the DWT sub-bands. To validate the veracity of the ordering scheme, 1000 images from the Corel 1000A database, their visual complexity and features were taken into account. The results confirmed that high embedding capacity, appreciable visual quality of watermarked images and complete recovery hidden data are realizable based on the ordering scheme proposed in this study.
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**INTRODUCTION**

A consequence arising from the recent growth and advancements in the field of digital communication technology is the ease with which information can be produced, exchanged and copied. This has made the need for state-of-the-art algorithms to protect data and multimedia such as text, images, video, sound, etc., against un-authorized copying and tampering both mandatory and de rigueur (Al-Asmari et al., 2012).

Digital watermarking is a technique that proffers a means to guard digital content from illegal copying and manipulation. Over the past few years these digital watermarking techniques have become more advanced, sophisticated and robust. Using a good watermarking technique, it is possible to extract the data embedded in the image at a later stage, or detect its presence in the multimedia element for diverse purposes including copyright protection, access control and broadcast monitoring. Depending on the type of data and applications, or target audience, each watermarking strategy may be designed to enhance at least one of the properties: capacity, robustness or visual quality (a.k.a. imperceptibility) of the original data. A digital watermark is an unnoticeable signal added to digital data, known as cover content (image, sound, etc., as the case may be), which can possibly be identified at a later stage for identification, authentication or the like. Thus, Digital watermarking can be categorized as image watermarking, video watermarking or audio watermarking depending upon the nature of the cover content. Contemporary digital watermarking schemes chiefly target image and video copyright protection (Wang and Zhao, 2006). Commonly, a digital watermark is a code that is embedded within an image. It plays the role of a digital signature, providing the image with a sense of ownership or authenticity. The primary benefit of watermarking is that the content is not separable from the watermark. Watermarking can be divided into diverse categories in a wide range of ways. It is categorized into non-blind, semi-blind and the blind schemes on the basis of the requirements for watermark extraction or detection (Tao and Eskicioglu, 2004; Weng et al., 2008). In another category, robust watermarking is commonly
designed to resist malicious attacks like scaling, cropping, lossy compression, etc. and is chiefly focused on copyright protection. On the contrary, fragile watermarking is used when the intention is to identify any tiny modification to the original digital content (Weng et al., 2008).

Extensive and recent researches on watermarking techniques for copyright protection have been introduced in the literature including (Kim and Moon, 1999; Elbasi and Eskicioglu, 2006; Makhoghi et al., 2010; Cui and Li, 2011; Wang et al., 2010). Some conventional wavelet watermarking techniques embed the watermark in the components of the first level Discrete Wavelet Transform (DWT). Other techniques, that perform a second level decomposition, obtain the approximation sub-band from the first level decomposition and then decompose it further (Salama et al., 2011).

In Al-Asmari et al. (2012), we proposed an embedding process based on an ordering of the DWT decomposed content of the cover images as determined by the watermark strength. The proposal exploits the relationship between the strength of the watermark (or gain factor), \( K \) and the imperceptibility of the resulting watermarked images in order to prioritize the ordering of sub-bands of the second order decomposed content of the cover image for the watermark embedding procedure. Using this ordering, the second level DWT decomposed content of the cover image is transformed using the Pixel Value Difference (PVD) in order to embed and recover the hidden data.

Here in, we validate the earlier proposal by considering a larger database comprising of 1000 images from varying categories, content and, hence, the visual complexity of images as perceived by the Human System (HVS) (Le et al., 2012, 2011). The results suggest that notwithstanding the content and complexity of the host images, the proposed ordering of the DWT sub-bands do not change significantly hence, yielding high embedding capacity, good visual quality of watermarked images and efficient watermark recovery.

Succinctly put, the work presented in this study is targeted at improving the embedding capacity and visual quality of watermarked images, while also guaranteeing the complete recovery of the data hidden inside the hitherto watermarked versions of the images.

To accomplish this, our attention is mainly focused on understanding and utilizing the notion of visual complexity of images. Using the Corel 1000A dataset, we generalized the SND visual complexity space (Le et al., 2012, 2011) correlated it with the watermark strength dependent DWT-based watermark embedding in (Al-Asmari et al., 2012). Based on these generalizations, we deduced a relationship between visual complexity of an image and the watermark strength required for effective data hiding. This relationship was used to determine the best ordering to embed the watermark into the second order DWT decomposed content of the cover image using the PVD method.

The proposed ordering scheme enhances the watermark embedding capacity, ensures faithful watermark recovery and guarantees visual fidelity of the watermarked versions of the images. The details of the proposed scheme and its evaluation are presented in subsequent sections of the study.

**METHODOLOGY**

**The role of gain factor in effective hiding of information:** In determining the ordering of the sub-bands of the cover image for the watermark embedding, the cover image is decomposed into its first and second tier regions using discrete wavelet transform. The first and second level DWT decomposition of an image is depicted in Fig. 1.

The watermark strength or gain factor, \( K \), was shown, in Salama et al. (2011), to have a huge impact of the visual quality of watermarked images and their peak-signal-to-noise-ratios, PSNR, values. Its choice affects the embedding and extraction of hidden data from watermarked images. Figure 2 summarizes the relationship between the gain factor and the fidelity of the watermarked images, denoted by the PSNR values, for the Lena cover image (Salama et al., 2011).

The chart in the figure (Fig. 2) shows the choice of the best value of \( K \) for each sub-band of the decomposed image. It indicates the variation in the values of \( K \) that would enable the complete recovery of the hidden data. As seen from this figure, the HH band produces the least value of \( K \), hence, it is considered as the best sub-band to hide the watermark logo. In contrast, the LL band would yield the worst watermarked image because it has the highest value of \( K \) (as high as 6 in the LL2 sub-band, which is also referred to as the LLLL sub-band).

Consequently, this suggests that the choice of \( K \) influences the fidelity (PSNR) of watermarked images as manifested in the chart in Fig. 3 for the same Lena cover image. From this figure we see that the LL2 and HL2, i.e., second level decomposed sub-bands, of the HH band (the HHLL and HHHH sub-bands) have the highest PSNR values (close to 50 dB), while the worst PSNR values are found in the LLLL sub-band. This inverse relationship is further summarized in Fig. 4. The PSNR value decreases as \( K \) increases until it reaches its maximum value (at \( K \) equal to 20).

![Fig. 1: A DWT decomposed image, its 4 bands (LL, HL, LH and HH) and second level sub-bands LL2, HL2, LH2 and HH2](image)

The foregoing discussions indicate that the least value of $K$ is always most desirable in terms of high embedding and recovery of the data hidden in images. For the Lena image, the least value of $K$ is found at $K = 0.5$, i.e., in the HHLL sub-band. It was also proven in Salama et al. (2011) that hiding data in the HHLL sub-band produces high fidelity marked images whose original content can be completely recovered. As noted earlier, Fig. 4 shows the variation between the watermarked image fidelity (PSNR) and the change in $K$ for the Lena host image as presented in Al-Asmari et al. (2011).

In the sequel, we revise the SND space for representing visual complexity and generalize the aforementioned relationship between the choice of best $K$ and the quality (capacity and imperceptibility) for a larger dataset, the Corel 1000A database.

**SND space for representing image visual complexity:** The evaluation of visual complexity of images is important in revealing the depth of information hidden in the images besides the lower level information pertaining to their colors, brightness and edges. This high level property is useful in many real applications of image processing, such as feature extraction, image watermarking and feature mining (Iliyasu et al., 2013b). Visual complexity has been represented using single features such as quad tree (Yaghmaee and Jamzad, 2005), edge based measurement (Mario et al., 2005), fuzzy measures of entropy (Cardici et al., 2009) and entropy based information (Rigau et al., 2005).

Figure 5 shows a simple case of varying visual complexity of three images (increasing from left to right), one each from the flower, food and building categories of the Corel 1000A database (Griffin et al., 2013).

In Le et al. (2011, 2012), a 3D space was used to represent the visual complexity of an image based on its inherent properties, specifically, the structure, noise and diversity hidden in the image itself. This space was appropriately named the SND space because of the features it is built upon.

Figure 6 shows a typical representation of an SND space for a dataset comprising of a few images.

When an SND space is constructed from a set of images, its inherent structure in terms of clusters reveals the visual complexity of images in that space (Le et al., 2011, 2012). In order to identify these clusters, clustering methods such as k-means, fuzzy c-means algorithms can be applied. The labels assigned to the clusters in the SND space express subjective evaluation of the visual complexity of the images by the Human Visual System (HVS). When these labels are assigned to clusters, a new image is automatically categorised by using its visual complexity value to assign to the cluster whose cluster centre is closest to the visual complexity value as demonstrated in the Fig. 7.

The three labels, ‘complex’, ‘normal’ and ‘simple’, are assigned based on the results of the k-means clustering algorithm on three classes. The number of images from the Corel 1000A database that fall in each visual complexity class are summarized in Table 1.
Fig. 5: A few sample images from the Corel 1000A database showing increase in visual complexity from left to right.

Fig. 6: The SND space indicates visual complexity of images.

Fig. 7: Clusters in the SND space indicating visual complexity of images.

Fig. 8: The sample images for the three visual complexity clusters as extracted from the SND space that was built using the 1000 images in the Corel 1000A dataset.

Fig. 9: Images at the centre of visual complexity clusters as extracted using the SND space for the Corel 1000A dataset.

Table 1: Number of images in each cluster using k-means algorithm with 3 clusters on the Corel 1000A dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of images</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All images in a cluster are assumed to have the same visual complexity. Meanwhile, the clusters in the SND space and the visual complexity labels express intuitive relations, i.e., an image is considered as complex if it has high structure, noise and diversity; or normal, if it has medium structure, noise and diversity, or simple if the three features are low. Some representative images belonging to the three visual complexity classes for some categories of the Corel 1000A dataset are shown in Fig. 8. As seen there from, images in the simple cluster contained only one predominant object such as a human face, or a building and a somewhat flat or continuous background. In similar fashion, images comprising two or three predominant objects and a constant background and those characterized by numerous objects and irregular or discontinuous backgrounds are classified as having normal and complex visual complexity, respectively (Le et al., 2012).

Figure 9 shows images located at the centers of the simple (Dinosaurs.061), normal (Buses.023) and complex (Mountains.096) clusters. We shall use these images as representatives of the simple, normal and complex images. The number of images in each cluster as realised using the SND visual complexity space were earlier summarized in Table 1.

Similar to the earlier discussion on the choice of best $K$ for an image in preceding section and (Al-Asmari et al., 2012), we present in Fig. 10 to 12 the variation of the gain factor for in the LL, LH, HL and HH regions for the representative images that are located at centers of the simple, normal and complex image clusters (i.e., Dinosaurs.061, Buses.023 and Mountains.096, respectively).

In a similar fashion, using the figures in Fig. 10 to 12, we show, in Fig. 13 to 15, the variation in PSNR values in the LL, LH, HL and HH sub-bands for the representative images (i.e., the Dinosaurs.061, Buses.023 and Mountains.096 images) for the simple, normal and complex images.
Fig. 10: The best K for the watermarked version of the image at the centre of the ‘simple’ cluster (Dinosaurs.061)

Fig. 11: The best K for the watermarked version of the image at the centre of the ‘normal’ cluster (Buses.023)

Fig. 12: The best K for the watermarked version of the image at the centre of the ‘complex’ cluster (Mountains.096)
Fig. 13: Variation in PSNR values at different regions of the watermarked logo as recovered from the representative image for ‘simple’ cluster

Fig. 14: Variation in PSNR values at different regions of the watermarked logo as recovered from the representative image for ‘normal’ cluster

Fig. 15: Variation in PSNR values at different regions of the watermarked logo as recovered from the representative image for ‘complex’ cluster
Figure 16 shows the ordering of the sub-bands of the DWT decomposed host image representing the simple normal and complex clusters based on the evaluation of the best K.

In this figure, the rightmost letters (LL, HL, HL and HH) indicate the bands of the DWT decomposed host image, while the remaining two letters specify the second level DWT sub-bands as explained earlier in Fig. 1. The indexes 1-12 indicate the priority accorded to each sub-band in the watermark embedding procedure.

The exquisite performance regarding the ease and quality of the embedding and extraction of data presented thus far and in (Al-Asmari et al., 2012) are, however, not generalised for all the sub-bands and therefore there is the need to cull from the 16 sub-bands that make up the best for both the watermark embedding and extraction. Hence, the need to prioritize the ordering of the sub-bands based on the best choices of K.

In deciding on the orderings in Fig. 16 we ignored the LL region of the DWT decomposed sub-band of the host image because it has been proven to have an adverse effect on the quality of watermarked images and extraction of second level decomposed cover images the ones that are on the quality of watermarked images and extraction of hidden data in already marked images (Al-Asmari et al., 2012; Salama et al., 2011).

The ordering suggested here guarantees high embedding capacity, good visual quality watermarked images and complete recovery of the hidden data, i.e., the watermark.

Figure 17 shows the 10 sample images from the Corel 1000A dataset that were used together with the images located at the centre of the simple, normal and complex image clusters.

Fig. 16: Ordering for the second order DWT decomposed contents of the representative images in the simple, normal and complex image clusters

Fig. 17: Sample images from the 10 categories of the Corel 1000A dataset

| Table 2: Sub-band ordering for the different images in the 10 categories (one for each category) of the Corel 1000A dataset |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Order | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Africa | HHHH | HHHH | HHHH | HHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH |
| Beach | HHHH | HHHH | HHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH |
| Buildings | HHHH | HHHH | HHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH |
| Buses | HHHH | HHHH | HHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH |
| Dinosaurs | HHHH | HHHH | HHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH |
| Elephants | HHHH | HHHH | HHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH |
| Flowers | HHHH | HHHH | HHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH |
| Foods | HHHH | HHHH | HHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH |
| Horses | HHHH | HHHH | HHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH |
| Mountains | HHHH | HHHH | HHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH | LHHH |
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complex clusters in order to determine the best order for each category (of images in the Corel 1000A database) as presented in Table 2.

Using the ordering in Fig. 16 and Table 2, a generalized DWT decomposed sub-band ordering of the images can be obtained irrespective of the content and perceptual complexity of the images. This generalized ordering is presented in Fig. 18.

This ordering generalizes the DWT decomposed ordering (Al-Asmari et al., 2012) for data hiding and recovery and adopting the scheme in Al-Asmari et al. (2011), it shall be used in our proposed Pixel Value Difference (PVD)-based watermark embedding and extraction system (Salama et al., 2011) as presented in the next section.

To accomplish the watermark embedding, the DWT decomposed sub-bands of the cover image were analyzed and ranked in terms of their ability to withstand changes that do not imperil the visual quality (PSNR) of the watermarked image. Based on this analysis, the contents of each pixel in the watermark image are assembled into an 8-bit binary (0-1) bit stream. The Most Significant Bits (MSB) from each pixel are then gathered and hidden in the best wavelet sub-band, the HLLH region, while the Least Significant Bits (LSB) are spread within the HHHH region. Finally, the remainder of the bits from the watermark stream are spread in the remaining 6 sub-bands of the host image. This procedure is depicted in Fig. 19 and discussed at length in Al-Asmari et al. (2011).

Figure 20 and 21 present the generalized block diagrams for the data hiding embedding and recovery that combine to make up the proposed scheme as presented in Al-Asmari et al. (2011), wherefrom further discussions can be sought.

To extract the watermark image, the 8 highest ranked wavelet sub-bands were decomposed from the watermarked image then the reverse PVD method was used to extract 8 streams of bits from each sub-band.

---

**Fig. 18: Generalized DWT sub-band ordering for high performance hiding of data in images**

**Fig. 19: Watermark bit stream embedding on host image for the representative image located at the centre of the ‘simple’ cluster (Dinosaurs.061)**
Fig. 20: The watermark embedding procedure (Al-Asmari et al., 2011)

Fig. 21: The watermark recovery procedure
The first bits from each bit stream were gathered to retrieve the content of the first pixel of the watermark. The second bits of the bit stream were similarly gathered in order to recover the second pixel and so on until the entire content of the watermark signal/logo are recovered.

Experimental discussions presented in the next section ascertain the extent to which the proposed ordering combines with the PVDN based watermark embedding and extraction highlighted in this section to produce a better data hiding stratagem.

**EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

To validate the veracity of the ordering proposed in the preceding sections, a dataset comprising 12 (cover or host) images (each of 256×256 pixel size) of varying visual complexity and labelled as Fingerprint, Baboon, Mountains.096, Flintstones, Buses.023, Couple, Lena, Boats, Dinosaurs.061, Elaine, Blood cells and Building, which in that order are arranged according to their visual complexity as determined using the SND visual complexity space respectively (with complexity decreasing from left to right as we go downwards from the topmost row), were used as cover images on to which various sizes (110×110, 64×64 32×32 and 16×16) of the SAU logo watermark are hidden. The watermark embedding and extraction is carried out as detailed in the PVD-based system highlighted in above section.

Noteworthy from this dataset (Fig. 22) is the fact that the SND visual complexity space labels the popular Baboon and Lena images as being ‘complex’ images. This is mainly attributed to the edgy and highly textured nature of the images. The rest of this section is devoted to explanations about the experimental setup and analysis of the results obtained.

Compared alongside some recent data hiding techniques in Yaghmaee and Jamzad (2010) and Zhang et al. (2008), the proposed scheme exhibited appreciable performance in terms of both watermark embedding capacity and fidelity of the watermarked

![Fig. 22: Dataset showing the images (and the last image-the SAU watermark logo) used to evaluate the proposed scheme. The images are arranged according to their visual complexity as determined using the SND space (Le et al., 2012)](image)

![Fig. 23: Watermarked versions of 256×256 Lena, Dinosaur.061, Buses.023, and Mountains.096 host images; the 110×110 SAU watermark logos recovered from the watermarked images; and the PSNR values of the watermarked images](image)
images represented by PSNR values as summarized in Table 3 for the Lena and 3 representative images (the Dinosaurs.061 for the ‘simple’ cluster, Buses.023 for the ‘normal’ cluster and Mountains.096 for the ‘complex cluster’).

Using these underpinnings, we conclude the section with an evaluation of the performance of the proposed data hiding technique alongside some recent watermarking methods.

Being the most widely used metric for comparing the fidelity of a watermarked image with its original version (Iliyasu et al., 2012; Iliyasu, 2013a; Salama et al., 2013), Peak-Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR) will be used as our watermarked image quality evaluation metric.

Each of the cover images in our dataset was paired with SAU logo watermark. The resulting watermarked images, the recovered (extracted) watermark logo and PSNR values for the Lena and 3 representative images are presented in Fig. 23.

The evaluation of the visual quality of the watermarked versions of the Lena, Dinosaurs.061, Buses.023 and Mountains.096 images in our dataset (Fig. 22) using smaller sized versions (64×64, 32×32 and 16×16) of the SAU watermark logo are presented in Table 4. These results indicate an average PSNR of 37.58, 36.90 34.05 and 31.43 dB, respectively for the 16×16 version of the SAU watermark logo that was embedded onto the Lena, Dinosaurs.061, Buses.023 and Mountains.096 images.

Table 4: Evaluation of watermarking capacity of the proposed method alongside some recent methods (Yaghmaee and Jamzad, 2010; Zhang et al., 2008) (for 256×256 Lena image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Bits</th>
<th>PSNR (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zhang</td>
<td>80,599</td>
<td>31.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaghmaee</td>
<td>73,896</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed method</td>
<td>96,800</td>
<td>33.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSION

DWT decomposition of an image reveals a lot of information about such an image. Using a perspicacious analysis of this information, the best regions of a host image best suited to hide some secret data can be deduced. This study proposes a stratagem to accomplish that. In doing so, the most significant data from a watermark is hidden in the sub-bands of the DWT decomposed cover image that exhibit the least gain factor. This way, the visual quality and embedding capacity of the watermarked image are enhanced. In addition, the proposal guarantees an efficient recovery of the hidden data. To determine the best ordering for hiding the data, various types of images of varying content and visual complexity were considered, analyzed and ranked in terms of their ability to withstand changes that do not imperil the visual quality (PSNR) of the watermarked image. Depending on this proposed ordering, an N×N-sized watermark stream is hidden in the 8 highest ranked sub-bands. The visual complexity classification of an image as simple, normal or complex of an image based on the structure, noise and diversity inherent to it was used to generalise an ordering of the DWT decomposed sub-bands of the image. Specifically, the MSBs from each pixel are then gathered and hidden in the best wavelet sub-band, the HLLH region, in order to enhance the robustness, while the LSBs are spread within the HHHH region. Finally, the remainder of the watermark stream is spread in the remaining 6 sub-bands of the host image in order to enhance the security of the data. Using the proposed strategy, a 256×256 Lena image had the capacity to accommodate 96800 bits of the SAU watermark logo while still maintaining an appreciable visual quality manifested by a PSNR value of 33.66 dB.

In on-going work, effort is being focussed on how to improve the SND visual complexity space so that it can be used to further enhance the quality of the data hiding techniques and other uses in image retrieval and computer vision.
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